REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 12 and 20 are amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments.


103 Rejections

Claim 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thelen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,534). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 1-24 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Thelen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,534).


The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to method of performing computer implemented recognition comprising:

> ... a) accessing user input to be recognized; b) on a mobile
> device, performing a coarse recognition process on said
> user input to generate a coarse result; c) displaying a portion
> of said coarse result on a display screen of said mobile device;
> d) performing a detailed recognition process on said user input
> to generate a detailed result; e) performing a comparison of
> said detailed result and said coarse result; and f) displaying
> a portion of said comparison on said display screen.

Independent Claims 12 and 20 recite limitations similar to those of Claim 1.

Claims 2-11 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 13-19 depend from independent Claim 12 and Claims 21-24 depend from Claim 20.

Thelen et al. does not does not anticipate or render obvious a method of performing computer implemented recognition that includes performing a detailed recognition process on said user input to generate a detailed result that includes "performing a comparison of said detailed result and said coarse result; and f) displaying a portion of said comparison on said display screen" as is recited in Claim 1. In order to meet the aforementioned limitation of Claim 1 a reference must show or suggest, either expressly or inherently, along with the other limitations of Claim 1: (1) the performance of a comparison of a detailed result and a coarse result; and (2) the display of a portion of the comparison on a display screen.

Thelen et al. only shows a distributed client-server speech recognition system. Thelen et al. is concerned with and does not teach the display of any type of comparison between recognition results let alone a portion of a comparison between recognition results. The Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations drawn to a display of a portion of a comparison of recognition results represents significant and non-obvious distinctions between the invention disclosed by Thelen et al. and the embodiments of the Applicant's invention that are set forth in the Applicant's claims. The Applicant respectfully requests that if the position, as set forth in the outstanding Office Action, that these limitations are "extremely" well known is maintained, a reference that shows these limitations should be supplied with the next Office Action in accordance with the provisions of MPEP 2144.03.

The Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Thelen et al. reference is the recited limitation of Claim 1 "performing a comparison of said detailed result and

said coarse result; and f) displaying a portion of said comparison on said display screen" shown or suggested.

Additionally, Thelen et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a recognition system that includes a mobile device that performs a coarse recognition process on a user input and includes a computing system that receives the user input from the mobile device and performs "a detailed recognition process thereon to return a detailed result to said mobile device for comparison with said coarse result" as is recited in Claim 12 (Claim 20 contains similar limitations). As discussed above, Thelen et al. only shows a distributed client-server type speech recognition system. The Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Thelen et al. reference is it shown or suggested that a mobile device perform a detailed recognition process and return a detailed result to a mobile device for comparison with a coarse result as is recited in Claim 12 (Claim 20 contains similar limitations).

Thus, in addition to not teaching the limitations of Claim 1 Thelen et al. does not teach the limitations of Claims 12 and 20. Consequently, Thelen et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 12 and 20.

Because Thelen et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 1, 12 and 20, Claims 1, 12 and 20 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-11 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 13-19

dependent on Claim 12 and Claims 21-24 dependent on Claim 20 likewise overcome the basis for rejection as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are in condition for allowance.

Claim 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thelen et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,534). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 25-34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Thelen et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,534).

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 25 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a recognition system comprising:

> ... a mobile device accessing user input and performing a
> coarse recognition process on said user input to generate a
> first result; a background recognition process on said mobile
> device that performs a second recognition process on said
> user input, said background recognition process returning a
> detailed result to a foreground application of said mobile
> device; and a data link between said mobile device and a
> second computing system; wherein said second computing
> system receives a user input from said mobile device, said
> second computing system performing a third recognition
> process to return a second detailed result to said mobile device.

Claims 26-34 depend from independent Claim 25 and set forth additional limitations of the claimed invention.

Thelen et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a recognition system that performs detailed recognition processes on a user input to generate a coarse result and a first detailed result and includes a second computing system that performs a "third recognition process to return a second detailed result to said mobile device."

Thelen et al. only shows a distributed client-server speech recognition system. Thelen et al. is concerned with distributing two speech recognition functionalities (coarse and detailed) between the client and the server components of a client-server network and not with the performance of a third recognition process. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Claim 25 recitation of a third recognition process provides a significant and non-obvious distinction between the invention disclosed by Thelen et al. and the embodiment of the Applicant's invention that is set forth in Claim 25.

In fact, Nowhere in the Thelen et al. reference is a recognition system, as set forth in Claim 25, that performs detailed recognition processes on a user input to generate a coarse result and a first detailed result and includes a second computing system that performs a third recognition process to return a second detailed result to a mobile device shown or suggested. Consequently, Thelen et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's invention as is set forth in Claim 25.

Because Thelen et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the Applicant's invention as set forth in Claim 25, Claim 25 overcomes the basis for rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that

Claims 26-34 dependent on Claim 25 likewise overcome the basis for rejection as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are in condition for allowance.

## SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending Claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Anthony C. Murabito at (408) 938–9060.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO
& HAO LLP

Dated: 1/10, 2005

Anthony C. Murabito
Registration No.: 35,295
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060